R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 143 FL 000 021

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE PREPARATION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS IN THE WAKE OF THE MACALLISTER REPORT.

BY- MACALLISTER, ARCHIBALD

PUB DATE DEC 65

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$0.36 9P.

DESCRIPTORS- *MODERN LANGUAGES, *COLLEGE TEACHERS, *TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS, *TEACHER EDUCATION, *COLLEGE LANGUAGE PROGRAMS, DOCTORAL PROGRAMS, INSTITUTES (TRAINING PROGRAMS), TEACHER IMPROVEMENT, METHODS COURSES, MACALLISTER REPORT, SAN FRANCISCO

THE SPEECH SUMMARIZES THE REACTIONS OF THE MACALLISTER REPORT, "THE PREPARATION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS OF MODERN LANGUAGES," A 1963 STUDY SPONSORED BY THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION AND FUNDED BY THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. DISCUSSED ARE THE VIEWS OF CRITICS WHO THOUGHT THE REPORT WENT TOO FAR IN ITS SUGGESTED REFORMS, PROGRAMS, AND INNOVATIONS AND THOSE WHO THOUGHT IT DID NOT ADVOCATE ENOUGH. IN ADDITION, A SUMMARY IS GIVEN OF THE POSITIVE RESULTS THAT WERE PRODUCED DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY BY THE REPORT, INCLUDING CONFERENCES ON TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS AND SEMINARS DEALING WITH THE PREPARATION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS AND COLLEGE TRAINERS OF TEACHERS. THIS SPEECH WAS DELIVERED AT THE STATEWIDE BIENNIAL CONFERENCE OF THE CCFLTA (4TH, SAN FRANCISCO, NOVEMBER 6, 1965) AND WAS PUBLISHED IN THE "FOREIGN LANGUAGE NEWSLETTER OF CALIFORNIA," DECEMBER 1965. (AM)

ED012143

Foreign Language NEWSLETTER

published by
THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
and the
MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

DECEMBER, 1965

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

This copy is sent to you courtesy of the
OFFICE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROGRAMS AND THE BUREAU OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT ADMINISTRATION OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Recent Developments in the Preparation of College Teachers in the Wake of the MacAllister Report

Address delivered at the Jack Tar Hotel on the occasion of the Fourth Statewide Biennial Conference of the CCFLTA, November 6, 1965.

Thank you, CCFLTA President Presta; Dean Churchill, President Knoll of FLANC and President Martin of MLASC, colleagues and friends: I feel deeply honored to be with you this morning and to be able to share in your deliberations of the next day and a half. You have aroused my admiration by a number of things. First, I am a firm believer in the desirability, in fact the great need, of state organization within our profession. You in California have a number of handicaps to easy communication, principally in the configuration of your state which leads naturally to a north/south division-of which I have heard. Yet you have been able to overcome this by such an excellent device as this Council which brings together all language groups, with great resulting benefits to our common cause. And your NEWSLETTER is something to be very justly proud of. When I went through the issue that announced this meeting, and reprinted in its entirety what has come to be known as the MacAllister Report, I was filled with sincere admiration for the scope of the undertaking, and even more for its quality. (I am not now referring to the report!) Since 1958 I have gone over quite a few state publications,-it was part of my job with the MLA. I find them all a praiseworthy effort, I certainly would not want to belittle any of them; but I must say that I have rarely, if ever, encountered as readable a publication as this one. There are no pieces of "boiler plate" or "space fillers", it is well set up, and the writing is of excellent quality. As I have reflected over these things in the past few weeks, I suddenly recalled something which had been quite forgotten for years. When I was a young man, 30-40 years ago, the word "California" had a special connotation for me and my northeastern sub-culture; it meant something big, warm, friendly, expansive (note the vowel there). Not at all in the sense in which Texas has come to mean big, that is to say overwhelming with more than a touch of vulgarity, (if no one shoots me). It is too bad that this Texas thing has tended to eclipse that more pleasant bigness and uniqueness that California represented, and which I have experienced in the warm hospitality you have extended to me.

The fact that you are giving a good deal of importance at this meeting to the Preparation of College Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages is another example of your willingness to take on large assignments. And not only large assignments but in this case one which is rather unpopular in certain circles, for there has been a singular reluctance on the part of many of our colleagues to discuss this Report freely, fully, and in the open. This hostility, if I may term it that, was n o t unexpected. American universities have grown accustomed to a sense of total autonomy. To put it more realistically, they have grown accustomed to feeling far enough above all the other units in the educational system to be exempt from criticism. Criticism from colleagues is especially unwelcome, for it violates a tacit understanding whereby the internal conduct of any institution of higher learning is to be officially ignored by all others. The activity of the AAUP is limited largely to one area, what might be called "labor relations", and there it is so conservative that some think of it as a company union. I was quite interested to learn some years ago through personal experience that various accrediting associations no longer like to think of themselves as engaged in granting or withholding accreditation, but rather as gentlemen come to visit other gentlemen. In such a context, it would be unspeakably rude to seem to pry too closely, or to offer more than a little carefully phrased advice. In our own field, consider the history of the reforms made or suggested in methods and materials. Originating with the MLA's Foreign Language Program, at whom have they been directed? At our colleagues in the elementary, and especially the secondary schools! I do not say this with any intention of belittling the importance of foreign language study at the pre-college levels; ideally it is there that our students should acquire mastery of their second language. Nor do I deny the need for improvement at those levels; after the disastrous deterioration of our discipline that took place during the thirties and forties the situation could hardly have been good. But, after all, who was producing those teachers who could not speak or understand their language, who could not even write it well, who took refuge from these deficiencies in increased emphasis on the cultural values of their subject-art, cathedrals, music - read about and discussed in English, of course? Who indeed but the colleges and Universities? And in those cases where well equipped and competent high school teachers were still operating, you know what happened to their students when they got to college? They found courses given in English about the language, or more frequently, about the history of the country's literature. The result in case after case was that most of the bright, impatient students switched to English completely or history, leaving the duller, less critical types to major in foreign languages, and become in their turn dull, incompetent, uncritical language teachers. (Present company excepted!) The plain, simple fact is that the whole educational system should be regarded as a continuum, with no significant break or hiatus between any of its sections: which is why I am glad to see you people so concerned with articulation. However, if I may express a point of view contrary to the conventional belief in the over-all importance of a good foundation, I have come to the conclusion, from my personal experience and my observation of others, that with talented students it is the last and highest levels that are of the utmost importance. When they are young and relatively undiscerning, bright students may and *do* tolerate faulty instruction at the lower levels. If they get into a good college, so far as our subject is concerned, with poor preparation they may and doubtless *will* have to work like mad to overcome the handicaps acquired lower down the scale. But at that age of keen discernment they can recognize that the goal is worth the struggle, and eventually we will have them as colleagues in the profession. But let the opposite happen - let them come, well trained, to a perfunctorily or badly run department, and that same discernment will send them away from us in disgust. And then what is their good foundation worth?

No, the college is the keystone of our educational structure, a fact which was recognized by the leaders of the FL Pro-

gram long before they turned their attention to that level in 1962. There was no lack of realization either that much of the lower-division teaching in universities throughout the country was of poor quality, to say the least and needed upgrading as much as did the work being done in the schools. It could hardly be otherwise in a system which gave only negative weight to teaching; if you taught well, that was fine, but it brought you no academic recognition; teaching assumed importance in your record only if you did such a bad job as to cause or threaten to cause a scandal, whereupon you were dropped. We must face the fact that the weight of authority in our departments tends to come into the hands of scholars who have little regard for the importance of language teaching, and less sympathy for its problems. Now, the MLA being what it is, it will not seem strange or unlikely to you that quite a few of the members of its policy-making and governing body will tend to be drawn from the ranks of scholars of that same type. Consequently, to secure their approval of an investigation into the preparation of college teachers took time and spadework, plus the sort of enthusiastic daring that John Fisher possesses. The fact that the Office of Education was anxious to have such a study made, and was willing to finance it, helped in determining the favorable decision. Even so, a number of Council members I talked with before the study was launched were full of qualms and qualifications. So it was not until Dec. 1962, after ten years of fruitful work in other branches of the profession, that the MLA's Executive Council authorized an inquiry into conditions and procedures prevailing among its own foreign language membership.

The result of that inquiry you have had placed before you in your current Newsletter. It could have been much longer, but the constantly repeated word was, "Keep it short!" It could have been more outspoken, but we were urged to tone it down. We planned at first to make our suggested teaching reforms part of a broad redesign of graduate work, but we soon realized that to do this would immediately antagonize quantities of scholars. We could have given more space to modern technology, but again we were warned not to antagonize those of our colleagues to whom such innovations are anathema. Our goal ultimately became to present as much of the truth as was necessary to prove the need for change, while at the same time keeping the presentation as palatable and as inoffensive as possible.

First published in Princeton in August of 1963, in an edition of less than five hundred copies, the Report quickly encountered mixed reactions. It proved of immediate assistance to several universities which were already planning training and supervisory programs for teaching assistants. On the other hand, the opposition it kindled in other quarters was astonishing in its violence. There was, for example, a campaign launched by chairmen of certain midwestern universities which have a co-operative organization, to stamp out the Report and discredit it before it was published in *PMLA*. An amusing sidelight on that outburst was furnished by the fact that several chairmen, members of the group, wrote in later, after they had actually read the Report, dissociating themselves from the protest. One chairman even ordered a number of copies to help in the reorganization of his department.

From that sort of rapid volte-face, you can easily believe that that particular reaction to the Report was based, not on reason, but on an almost hysterical rage that anyone should dare to interfere in the conduct of graduate studies. Most criticisms, however, were reasonable. In fact, they frequently reflected the minority views of individual members of the Conference that drafted the Report. I should like to cite two critics, and speak to their criticisms as I relate them, because I feel that they may correspond to views held by members of this group.

The first critic represents a distinct minority; people who felt that we had not gone far enough, or that we had not been realistic in facing the situation as it exists. This particular individual is a man of my own generation, a mid-westerner, a tireless battler for better teaching and better teacher training, and a pioneer in the audiovisual field. The first fault he finds is the Report's "failure to distinguish between graduate work for high school teachers (the terminal M.A. or M.A.T.) and work for the Ph.D." This is admittedly one of the points that gave us great trouble and caused us to waste much valuable time. Some of our conferees represented universities where the Ph.D. is still the primary goal; others directed programs almost exclusively for teachers who would end with the M.A. and go into high school. This gave us some trouble with the undergraduate program, but it became really confusing when we got to planning the graduate program. Practically everyone present had a rather strong personality, so that every once in a while, when we reached an impasse of some sort, some of our number would come up with an inspiration and we would follow his leadership with relief. The trouble came when that person was one of those preoccupied with the M.A.-and-into-high-school sort of program at home; we would invariably wake up to find ourselves designing programs exclusively for that clientele. Then would come the sad moment of awakening when we had to remind ourselves that our mandate was to prepare programs for the graduate student preparing to go into college teaching. After several such misadventures we realized that we would have to be ruthless if somewhat unrealistic. Our decision was to plan programs for a year or two years of graduate work, without regard to a specific degree goal. The best we could do for the terminal M.A. was to hope that he could accomplish the minimum essentials with the help of the summer before and the summer following his one year.

Several comments were directed at generalizations about relative achievement in intensive college courses and in ordinary high school courses. Obviously, our critic is correct in declaring that "extensive placement testing is the only solution." We thought we were on the side of the angels in this by pointing out the need for more accurate placement, and calling attention to the newly available MLA Cooperative Classroom Tests designed to evaluate the four language skills in five of the more commonly studied languages.

When our friend attacks us for "the . . .cavalier reference to audio-lingual approach, visual aids, programmed instruction," as "mere lip service", he is quite right. He could not know the repeated pressure I was under to get rid of even that "cavalier" footnote. And the reason for the pressure was not so much any indifference or hostility to such technological developments on the part of the Conference, but fear of arousing the hostility of our more conservative and less sophisticated colleagues.

Most of the remaining strictures of our hard-headed and realistic correspondent can be grouped under the heading of failing to face today's facts and to come to grips with *today's* realities, not to mention tomorrow's. To which I had to reply that Yale, Harvard and Columbia's facts are not necessarily Purdue's, nor are Chicago's bound to be the same as Berkeley's or San Francisco State's.

The other critique of the Report that I should like to present to you is much more typical of the reaction we expected and were trying to forestall than was the first criticism. After all, we did not expect to be blamed by many people for advocating half measures. The author of the following believes that we are undermining the best values of scholarship; he

said in his letter to me that his remarks are strongly critical "only to the extent I perceive in the Report symptoms of an anti-intellectual and anti-humanistic philosophy becoming more and more prevalent in our profession." Let us examine where he finds these pernicious elements.

Considering the various points treated in the Report in the order there used, he comments first on the Undergraduate Program, and seems to find no quarrel with what we advocate. He merely finds it inadequate, and says, "To this I should like to add the following: that in the first year (Fr. 3) and thereafter the student be introduced to literature; that he read the best literary texts commensurate with his instructional level (Sartre, Camus, etc.); that good twentieth-century poetry (Prévert, Aragon) also be used." (From this you can see that he is somewhat preoccupied with French.) Far from being in disagreement with my own views, this sounds remarkably like the early reports of the Northeast Conference Committee on the Role of Literature which I chaired some 10 years ago. The point at issue is that the writer has undertaken to prescribe the *content* of the course, whereas in all our recommendations we deliberately strove to avoid questions of course content, for we believed that to enter into such discussions might well be considered meddling, and we were dangerously close to meddling as it was. In this particular question, I should qualify the extent of my agreement now: if the design of the course is such as to allow the introduction of such reading at a very early stage (always assuming that French 3 is the first or second term of a beginning course), I should want to make very sure that the emphasis of the instruction was not shifted from mastery of the language skills to a consideration of literature *as such* — for that I should oppose with all my might.

This critic also regrets that the Report saw fit to devote so little space to the course which introduces the student to the literature. As with the language program, he agrees with what we have said, but he blames us for not having considered questions of course content and procedure. Here I can sympathize with him, for I actually wrote much more about this crucially important course than appears in the Report. But I had to agree with my colleagues that it was wiser to omit such discussions as the various ways such a course may be organized; there are too many variables from literature to literature and from stiuation to situation. It seemed to us that what we *did* say about the importance of making such a course lively, interesting, and a real introduction to the critical treatment of literature was too important to risk its getting lost in too much detail.

All the preceding criticisms however were only shadow-boxing. The real battle is joined, as we knew it would be, when we come to the Major Program; and, as we anticipated, the targets are our proposal for continuing language study by the major, and our advocacy of certain unconventional subjects as valuable adjuncts to the major.

The writer begins, "Emphasis on language is commendable in and of itself but runs the risk of entering into conflict with literature." Truer words were never written. It is exactly because the acquisition of a really good command of the language has always entered into conflict with literature in our colleges and *emerged from it the loser* that the Report put so much stress on continuing language development throughout the major years. I am sure numbers of you have met the phenomenon of linguistic regression in your majors; if not, you should count yourselves fortunate exceptions. The critic continues, "Each additional required course in language will mean for most majors one less course in literature." To which I can only reply by asking, "When and where is this prospective teacher of the foreign language going to get his proficiency in its use?" Because we *are*, after all, concerned with future teachers, not majors who are going into advertising or to law schools. They will certainly not get it in this man's graduate school, for he says of this level, "All the literature courses they can be made to take will only partially plug the gaps in their knowledge." If it is anti-intellectual and anti-humanistic to demand that a teacher and scholar of literature really command the language in which that literature is written, then I must plead guilty to being both those things. In the days when literary history was our principal occupation, the ability only to see a text as through a glass darkly did not make so much difference; but today, when we demand close reading of the texts themselves, with the ability to grasp those nuances which might be compared to harmonics or overtones in music, the reader needs to approximate the linguistic skill and resources of the writer if he is to avoid missing the riches that lie beneath the surface.

On one criticism I must agree; 18 hours of the major literature including the Introductory course are not enough. This is one of the few issues where we failed to reach real agreement. A goodly number of the conferees simply made the flat statement of fact that to require more would be meaningless in their institutions because of the limit placed there on total hours in one subject; worse than meaningless, it would offer an excuse to dismiss the entire Report as unrealistic. Hence the recommendation was made to fit that condition. However, there was enough strong feeling on the subject to enable me to preserve the final sentence in the paragraph in question :"The table's 18 hours in literature are to be considered a minimum." And if you can get more, for heaven's sake get it!

With regard to Linguistics and Culture or Cultural Anthropology or Civilization, our critic says, "I strongly object to such material included in a literature major." Of course, we did not so include them ourselves; we listed them as recommended electives for future teachers of language and literature.

Turning to the Graduate Program, the Report is censured for having ignored many vital issues, in spite of our having expressly stated that we were confining our concern to those skills and knowledges *needed for teaching* and not now included in most graduate programs. As for these subjects, only linguistics is accorded a possible claim to respectability, and here it is confidently stated, "The department philologist will. . .present some linguistic background in his regular Romance Philology courses." Apart from the rather quaint, old-fashioned sound of that statement, if that much is actually done, and done adequately, it may be sufficient. The bland assumption that it is a universal practice throughout our graduate schools reveals a vast unacquaintance with reality on the part of the writer. Of our proposed course in Methods, he says: "In a *good* university such courses are superfluous." Does he realize how few "good" universities there are, by that standard? With the same bland unawareness of reality, he continues; "The director of language teaching will have established a program for the training of T.A.'s, with demonstration classes. . ." If the generality of universities *had* a director of language teaching, our Report would probably not have been needed. If such training programs for T.A.'s were the rule, our problem would have been solved. Obviously, the man simply didn't read the earlier part of our Report where we gave the results of our survey showing that 80-90% of the teaching in many of the best universities in the country is done by totally untrained, inexperienced, and often incompetent teaching assistants.

A total disregard for our suggestions as to the content of a course in culture is displayed by his statement that it is "in-

formation as to French women, wine, and railroads. . . ."

To me this is really anti-intellectual; it is an unscholarly reaction-by-prejudice in complete disregard of evidence, it is complacent parochialism, at its worst. Unfortunately it is also the worst obstacle that must be faced by the Report or by any movement to bring graduate training into line with modern needs, for it can not be reached by reason.

However, there are among our colleagues in the graduate schools many who are more open to reason than our critic, but who share his feelings toward the new material we consider necessary to prepare our budding scholars to be teachers, too. Like him, they are inclined to extend respectability only to linguistics, and they do that reluctantly and after at least two decades of battling it. As to the other two, Teaching Methods and Culture, they react largely as did he: "Such material has nothing to contribute. . .It is unworthy of graduate credit."

The fact that Harvard gave a Professorship of French Civilization to Larry Wylie on the basis of his *Village in the Vaucluse,* and that the same university recognizes the courses in Methods of Jack Stein and Dwight Bolinger can be brushed off as the sort of quixotic eccentricity that one has come to associate with the Cambridge institution and which only *it* can get away with. Fortunately we have acquired more conclusive evidence that both fields can have substantial content, since the Report was published.

A contract from the U. S. Office of Education has made it possible for our distinguished colleague, Professor Howard Lee Nostrand of the University of Washington, to organize his long-nourished ideas on Culture, to implement them with added material, and to present them in an impressive form. I heard some of his material in his lectures at the Indiana University Seminar in the summer of 1964, and later I read and criticized several chapters, all of which makes me eager to see them in their published form. His book will not only fill a need for something tangible and solid in the field of culture, a need of which the Conference that advocated work in that field for future teachers was itself very much aware, but will probably stimulate the production of further material. Of course, for it to influence our reluctant colleagues they will have to read it, or at least read some review of it; and it is not easy to get them to do that, as we have seen.

The most unpalatable of these subjects that need to be introduced in the college teacher's training is also the most important one; we refer to it most conveniently as "Methods". This is unfortunately a term that makes the hackles rise on the backs of most liberal arts scholars; and their reaction has not been without cause. The Report tries to take the curse off of it by calling it "Principles of Language Teaching and Learning". Some of the universities that have adopted courses in this field call them "Applied Linguistics". Just a little over a year ago, the MLA decided to lend its weight to the establishment of respectable content for such a course, and held a two-day conference in the end of October, 1964. Results of a similar conference for the secondary level have already been published in the September, 1964, *PMLA.* Part II; reprints like this one, under the title, *Standards for Teacher Education Programs in Modern Foreign Languages,* can be obtained from the MLA office in New York. Andy Paquette assures me that a similar document for the colleges will be forthcoming just as soon as he can get a little spare time to write it up. You can see the size of the material presented as workpapers for that conference; I assure you that the content is equally substantial. From this material will come a set of suggestions, including an inclusive check-list of topics believed essential for a college teacher's professional preparation: syllabi of a number of courses actually being given, complete with bibliography; sample programs of orientation and supervision; and an over-all bibliography. Such a document ought to prove quite persuasive in the hands of the individual in a given graduate department who has managed to get his colleagues to take up the question of adding either a course or a training program, not to mention its great practical value for anyone asked to give such a course. The MLA is to be congratulated for having assembled this material, but at the same time it should be urged to make it available to the professions, with all possible speed.

I am happy to be able to say that the Report has done more than evoke criticism; it has produced a number of positive results, some quite directly related, others less so. This ought not to be surprising either when one considers that in addition to the 15.000 copies that went out to the membership of the MLA, and the several hundred copies of the original edition distributed by the Office of Education and individuals, very nearly a thousand copies have been sold by the Materials Center of the MLA. Although no one has thought to keep a systematic record of developments throughout the country, I can mention a few:

Of greatest significance, since it affects the modern language most widely studied in this country, is the influence John Fisher says the Report exercised on *The College Teaching of English,* especially the requirements for the Ph.D. in English. You can read about this in the English Program Notes at the back of the September *PMLA,* Part 1 - the one bound in blue. Then in our own field there are the increasing number of dual appointments, Foreign Languages and Education, some of which are connected with a new Doctorate in Foreign Language Teaching. Instances of these that come to my mind are Buffalo's new program which has brought Douglas Sheppard to that university from the State University of Montana; Anthony Pasquariello has a somewhat similar program at Pennsylvania State, as does Edward D. Allen at the Ohio State University. Some among you probably know of other cases; I'd appreciate it if you would give me the information on a post card addressed to me, at Lawrenceville, N.J.

One of the first developments of the Report was a two-day conference, something like this one, but infinitely smaller, of all the college and university foreign language teachers of the state of West Virginia; I had the privilege of addressing them and acting as consultant on March 6 and 7, 1964; this was only about 5 months after the Report had been printed in Princeton, and was a couple of months before it appeared in *PMLA.* It was quite an experience to see that small group, in the midst of all that Appalachia has since come to stand for, striving to apply the conditions recommended by our Conference. - Development of language proficiency during the first two years in college, with de-emphasis of grammar-translation, use of the MLA-Cooperative Tests in the four skills for placement of entering students, 30 hours minimum preparation for a foreign language major, linguistics and methods not to be included in this total, administration of the MLA Teacher Proficiency Tests toward the end of senior year and the establishing of norms for a standard provisional certificate; class size cut to 15-18; four-five hours per week in elementary and intermediate language courses; supervision and methods training for teaching assistants and instructors without experience. In addition, they were recommending as new standards for teacher education: Methods courses to be taught by a modern foreign language teacher, student-teaching by all candidates, supervision by a highly qualified language teacher of the elementary, junior high and senior high school programs in all systems in order to insure

effective teaching procedures, and coordination and continuity in the entire program; acceptance of the master's degree toward permanent certification only when the degree has been obtained in the specific language; credit toward renewal of certificates to be granted only for work directly related to the teaching field; use of the MLA Teacher Proficiency Tests as a factor in granting certification. New York has been using these tests for prospective teachers with irregular preparation; for example, natives who are often turned down because their record shows no courses in the language in which they were raised. I am not sure of the situation now in Pennsylvania; at one point the tests were "in", then people in Education found a pretext for having them put out, but when I last heard, they were in again.

Readers of the Report will remember that it advocates the establishment of summer institutes or seminars to speed and facilitate the improvement of teaching and of teacher training in colleges and graduate schools. In the summer of 1964, as many of you probably know, the Indiana Language Program, financed by the Ford Foundation, set up two seminars that were quite different though both dealt with the preparation of college teachers in our field. One of them, held at DePauw University, Greencastle, Indiana, had been planned primarily for teachers of Methods courses and others responsible for teacher education in Indiana state colleges; it ended up with 11 from the state and the same number from other states. Most of the participants were in Spanish, and about a third were in French. Professor Agnes Brady, of the University of Kansas and Professor Laurel Turk of DePauw mapped out a varied schedule for the four weeks that the Seminar lasted. The core consisted of Structure Problems and Language Analysis, Applied Literature and Civilization, and Instructional Techniques and Materials. These were supplemented by short courses on Programmed Instruction, Testing, Evaluation of Materials, and Articulation covering all levels, and lectures by visiting luminaries. The Final Report of that Seminar contains a good deal of interesting and valuable material including course outlines, bibliographies, and recommendations. If there are copies still available, they may be obtained from George E. Smith, Director of the Indiana Language Program, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. I visited there one day, but for the rest of the time I was too busy directing the other Seminar held in conjunction with the Linguistic Institute at Indiana University.

The Bloomington Seminar was of enormous interest to me because in general, it followed the lines recommended by our Report, and hence could be considered a pilot project. In one important respect it did not follow our recommendations; it was dreadfully over-structured. The consequences of fatigue and frustration among the participants were just as bad as the Conference had foreseen, and undoubtedly prevented the operation from achieving its full potential. This was a "senior" level Seminar, designed for faculty members with a considerable burden of responsibility for language teaching within their departments. When the selection had been completed, our 32 participants, 9 in French, 11 in German, 12 in Spanish, included department heads, the three professorial ranks, and several instructors who had or were going to have charge of programs for teaching assistants. Our program was of six weeks duration, six of the hottest weeks on record in that Southern Indiana community which has never been known as a summer resort; and few of our facilities were air-conditioned. Courses included the Psychology of Language Learning which proved a stimulating and disturbing experience for quite a few participants who were disappointed to discover how little was as yet firmly known in that field; Demonstration-Observation classes in each of the three languages, followed by a discussion of methods; Applied Linguistics for each language, and the Teaching or Presentation of Literature to college classes. As if this were not enough, there were four lectures a week on such subjects as The Teaching of Pronunciation, Testing, Programmed Instruction, and Culture. Then there were in addition excellent, high-powered lectures in conjunction with the Linguistic Institute, and many of our people felt they ought not to miss such an opportunity. As I look back now, I am amazed that we had no crack-ups; only one appendectomy and several instances of rather ill-tempered bickering, all of which goes to confirm what I have heard about the staying powers of older people.

I think that for most participants, the most valuable features of the Seminar were the Demonstration-Methods unit, the discussion of literature, and the simple fact of finding themselves together with colleagues from other parts of the country, who had problems not unlike their own, with a consequent give-and-take of suggestions and exchanging of experiences. In German we were especially fortunate to have as our demonstration teacher your own Klaus Mueller, who gave a brilliant and convincing example of the best "modern" teaching of a modern language. Likewise in Spanish we had great good fortune to have one of the finest practitioners of modern methodology, Guillermo del Olmo, formerly of Yale and now of Rutgers. His wife, known to many in the profession as Filomena Peloro, has been engaged in an important and interesting project here in California. The situation in French was less fortunate, the result of a very bad mischance in arranging for personnel. Professors Mueller and Del Olmo were both working from their own text material, with which they were completely familiar. I am sure I need not tell anyone here who has done audiolingual teaching how absolutely essential it is to have faith in your material and confidence in yourself; otherwise, your perormance, and in many respects it *is* a performance, just doesn't go over. Our French demonstration teacher was an admirable teacher as well as a phonetician of note; but she was called on to teach from an extremely innovating text with which she was not in complete agreement. The text moreover was still in manuscript form, and very often she did not get a look at what she was to do next, until just before the class. She was also to use some badly prepared tapes on a mediocre tape-recorder, with heavy construction machinery roaring and rumbling and jack-hammering away outside, with the windows sealed against the noise, and everybody quietly stewing inside. And, for the final touch, her pupils, as in the other two languages, unfortunately, were well above the average age of undergraduates - some were 60 or older - and hence they were not the most pliable or responsive material. It was remarkable how much was accomplished in spite of all these handicaps, but it could not obviously come up to the level attained in the other languages.

The other course with the greatest impact, the discussion of the ways of presenting literature, also varied with the language-group involved. By some sort of happy chance, the Spanish quickly developed into a highly congenial and cooperative group. No doubt the engaging personality of Professor Miguel Enguídanos was a large factor in their success; plus the fact that he, more than almost anyone else on the staff, managed to treat his participants as colleagues and not as students. This factor stood out more than any other in the comments that we have received from participants, and anyone considering the possibility of giving a similar seminar for senior and semi-senior personnel should pay particular attention to this; every possible aspect of the seminar should be designed to break down the strong tendency toward a teacher-class relationship. The physical arrangement

ESPECIALLY FOR CALIFORNIA

GETTING TO KNOW SPANISH

by César Muñoz-Plaza

A complete modern elementary Spanish program for the sixth grade

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY
182 SECOND STREET
SAN FRANCISCO 94105

itself is highly important; a round-table format will be found much more successful than an ordinary classroom. And ample opportunity should be provided for informal association between staff and participants as another way of maintaining an atmosphere of colleagues working together.

During this past year we attempted to assess the impact of the Seminar after the participants had returned to their jobs, or, in several cases, new and better jobs. Unfortunately the simple questionnaire did not get mailed until the end of the year when everyone was tremendously busy. As a result, we have received only 20 replies out of the 32 total. Of the 20, 9 rated the Seminar as excellent, 6 as Very Good, 3 as Good, 1 as Fair, 1 as Poor. 4 had received promotions or raises as a result of their participation, 6 were given more responsibility, 4 testified that when they spoke their views were now listened to. 10 replied that their professional confidence had greatly increased, 9 that their teaching had improved. 6 described improvements in their departments due to the Seminar: 2 with Methods courses added, 2 with such courses planned for the coming year, 1 the addition of Linguistics, 1 the use of the foreign language in their literature courses. 3 reported new programs for Teaching Assistants, 1, the improvement of an existing program, 2 reported that such a program was definitely planned. One of the participants enlisted financial support from a foundation for a research project in language teaching, and now he's not teaching at all. Another one organized and directed a state summer institute which she attributes directly to the Seminar. So our pilot operation which was designed particularly to radiate influence on other campuses would seem to have begun already to have some success in that direction.

I have dealt with these two Seminars at the close of my remarks because I hope some among you will be inspired to imitate them and improve on them. This is now possible under the same law that has given us the NDEA Institutes for Secondary School Teachers, under a reinterpretation of the language providing for "... individuals (1) who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, OR SUPERVISING OR TRAINING OF TEACHERS of history, geography, modern foreign languages, etc. in...secondary schools." Under this interpretation, all the participants in the DePauw Seminar, and a large share of those we had in Bloomington would be eligible. I believe further that we are on the way to solving the biggest difficulty we encountered in Indiana, that of obtaining representative demonstration classes. Regular departments sometimes will not want anything to do with such a Seminar. Really good, professional-level TV recordings will in the not too distant future enable us to present demonstrations by first-rate teachers in typical classroom situations with a flexibility never before possible, replaying important sequences, and selecting phases and stages of learning as needed for our teachers. This is already being done at Purdue and a few other places; all we need is money, and I'm sure we'll be able to get that. I would not be at all surprised to see California leading such a development - you're that kind of people. I wish you Godspeed and the best of luck!

Archibald MacAllister

Pen-Pals . . . And Tape-Pals

1) Letters Abroad, 18 East 60th Street, New York, 10022. Affiliated with Fédération Internationale des Organisations des Correspondances et d'Echanges Scolaires. 2) Bureau de Correspondance Scolaire, Director, Frances V. Guille, College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio. 3) International Friendship League, 40 Mt. Vernon Street, Boston, Massachusetts. 4) Office of Private Cooperation, U. S. Information Agency, 1776 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 5) Oficina Nacional de Correspondencia Escolar, Director, Hariey D. Oberhelman, Department of Foreign Languages, Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas. 6) S.T.E.P. Carl D. Bauer, 1713 Sherwood Road, New Cumberland, Pennsylvania. German Tape Exchange. 7) The Voicespondence Club, Noel, Virginia. Tape Exchanges. 8) World Tape Pals, Inc. Marjorie Matthews, Secretary, Box 9211, Dallas, Texas.

The Most Spoken Languages In The World

The top 12 languages and the number of people who speak them are: Chinese, 460 million; English, 250 million; Hindustani, 160 million: Spanish, 140 million; Russian, 130 million; German, 100 million; Japanese, 95 million; Arabic, 80 million; Bengali, 75 million; Portuguese, 75 million; French, 65 million, Italian, 55 million.

Foreign Language Week

The dates for *Foreign Language Week* will be March 27 to April 2 in 1966, according to an announcement of Dr. Stanford M. Miller, National Executive Secretary, Alpha Mu Gamma, Los Angeles City College. The association publishes interesting material most helpful in planning this yearly event.

Publishers of foreign language textbooks at all levels... from elementary grades through graduate school!

Crocker Park, Box 24400,
San Francisco, California

Represented in California by Noel Barrie, Richard Carpenter, Thomas Hall, Thomas McGaffic, R. William Movius, Carl J. Pendleton, Ralph Rees, Harold W. Sander, and Harold C. Snyder.

HOLT, RINEHART and WINSTON, inc.
383 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017

Ask the Holt representative in your area about appropriate titles for your curriculum.